1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori



593 Publicly a husband addresses his wife in a stern severe voice. Requests are commands, barked out in sharp phrases. It is important for a man's self-regard (ἐγωϊσμός) that other men should see that he is master in his own house. In public the wife is meek and modest, silent and submissive. She does not smile at him or laugh with him before strangers. But in the seclusion of the hut matters are otherwise. She abandons the mask of expressionless humility and discusses with her husband all the affairs of the family, putting forward her own suggestions in a respectful but fearless fashion. Yet even here respect is implicit and a wife must never use tones of mockery or abuse towards her husband.

Obedience to her husband is a moral imperative for the wife. 626 She will not be excused by public opinion, however badly she may have been treated by the man. She cannot refuse to co- 593 habit with him sexually. Conversely, the act of disobedience 837 by which she damages her husband most severely is adultery. 558 In adultery she makes her husband a cuckold (κερατᾶς), one who wears a horn. 'She puts horns on him' (τοῦ βάζει κέρατα), it is said. The implication that the cuckold wears a horn may be an ironical allusion to the sexual potency which his wife's action suggests he does not possess.[1] Adultery attacks the moral integrity and honour of the family and makes a laughing-stock 684 of its leader and head. Thus, Sarakatsani always insist that if a husband surprises the guilty parties in the act, he must first kill his wife and then her seducer. The axiomatic acceptance of family obligations, the uncompromising character of the sanction, and the extreme difficulty of conducting such a liaison secretly, are all factors which contribute to the extremely low incidence of adultery. Indeed, since 1950, there appears to have been only one clear and unambiguous case of discovered adultery.

593 The disobedience of the wife in the sense of flatly refusing to do the spoken bidding of her husband is also rare. This situation or the mutual irritation which arises over the 'trivia' of communal living results in the wife receiving a beating with a stick. The Sarakatsani of both sexes accept the right of a husband to 522 strike a disobedient or erring wife. It is also true, however, that men who are continually beating their wives (and certain men

[1] Cf. Pitt-Rivers, op. cit., p. 116; and Onians, op. cit., p. 243.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori



in behaviour outside the family. The affection of Sarakatsan children for their fathers is remarkable; and the positive sanction of the warmth of the father's reciprocal affection is correspondingly strong. The mother, on the other hand, remains the source of unconditional love, care, and support. When Lambrine, who is twelve years old, returned home with a note from the schoolmaster which said that on account of her constant inattention and consequent backwardness he intended to keep her in the same grade for another year, her father, Theodoros, harangued her bitterly in the courtyard of his house in front of an audience of half a dozen siblings and cousins. The crying child turned to her mother who silently comforted her while the father continued his merciless critism. It is significant on these occasions that the mother does not disagree with the father's strictness, nor does the father complain at the mother because she is comforting such a shameless child. It seems clear that their roles are complementary; the father acts as an agent of discipline and instruction through whom the child learns that he must hold his own against other children of the same age and sex and that in his behaviour he has a responsibility towards the whole family; the mother, while she does not deny that the child has done wrong, assures him that he is still wanted and accepted within the family circle.

However, very little direct instruction in correct behaviour is received by children through solemn lectures from the father or the mother in the form of 'You must do this, you must not do that.' Children of all ages are tolerated on almost all family occasions and no topic of discussion is considered unfit for their ears. They hear their elders interminably discussing and criticizing the behaviour of adults and children in other unrelated families. Rape, adultery, the quarrels of brothers, public disrespect to a father, the whole gamut of lapses from social virtue is brought indirectly to their attention. Furthermore, the child of ten or eleven is allowed to make his own contributions to such discussions which are listened to with attention if they are not always accepted as correct. During a discussion in one family about the shamelessness of villagers, the young son of eleven years old was able to give some interesting evidence about how he was sitting in a cherry tree when a villager began to seduce his sister-in-law immediately beneath. Out of his shame at the

/218 cont./

627
682
[602]
[581]
[182]
627
628
682
182

33. The same idea is to be found in antiquity: G. Glotz: La solidarité, p. 47-48.

Thus, there is no contradiction between the vendetta and the prohibition of homicide. If the execution of the murderer is avenged in turn that is because another principle comes into play, that of safeguarding at all costs the moral and social integrity of the family. The necessity to abide by this principle is so over whelming that the prohibition of homicide yields to it in the end.

It is true that this arrangement is not the most fortunate. However, it reflects very well the relations between the individual and /219/ the group, or rather the individual and the family, the choice in the final analysis being in favor of the group.

Moreover, there is no reason to assume that the vendetta presupposes a collective responsibility of the family groups in case of homicide: first, because they usually seek to kill the murderer himself; second, if they kill instead one of his close relatives, which is not unusual, this is not because they consider him co-responsible, but in order to weaken the family. That is why, furthermore they then choose the best, the most distinguished, the strongest.

As to the application of the vendetta, there is no procedure provided to judge the affair and to pronounce a verdict. Custom, known beforehand by all, is followed.

Carrying out the vendetta is the responsibility chiefly of the [562] youngmen of the family. The women are excluded from it both as victims and executers.

837
181
577

Sentimental and sexual relations outside marriage.

Sarakatsani society disapproves strongly of sentimental and sexual relations outside marriage.

A statement based on Sarakatsani ideology is very indicative in this respect. According to it, cases of this kind never occur among them, as

837 181 597 /219 cont./ though their nature in this respect were different from that of other human beings. Yet it must be acknowledged, nevertheless, that such relations are extremely rare.

597 837 684 627 602 The woman, young girl or wife, who carries on illicit relations risks being put to death either by her relatives or by her husband and the latter's relatives. Though marriage with the partner might possibly, if rarely, let the girl escape punishment, an adulterous woman is invariably punished.

Her lover too is exposed to the same punishment, the carrying out of which is incumbent on the relatives of the woman.

The Sarakatsani maintain that the justification for this severe punishment lies in the fact that the act of the woman (young girl or wife) dishonors her family or her husband and his relatives, and that only blood can wash away the stain.

[171] [182] [848] Moreover, this conviction is not peculiar to our herders; one finds it all over Greece. In our opinion this is an /220/ ideological sublimation of two principles: that of the societal control of individuals with regard to marriage, and that of the control of the legitimacy of descent, of which we have spoken above.

837 597 562 [593] [584] Observation shows that this belief in "wounded honor" as well as the drama that it provokes recede and diminish to the extent the children, the girls above all, free themselves from paternal and family authority in the matter of marriage and marry according to their own choice.

[684] If a lover is not punished by his own relatives for his illegitimate acts it is because, in a system dominated by pronounced patriarchy, the man is a privileged being to whom everything is permitted--a version obviously not acceptable to the relatives of the woman who accuse him of having ruined her.

[626] However, in such a case, the comments, regardless of who makes them, are much more severe towards the woman than towards her accomplice who

837 /220 cont./
577 "in the end is a man and is only seeking his pleasure."
576 Rape and abduction of a young girl.
684 These two acts are also punished with death by the relatives of the victim. But they too are extremely rare.
583 The kidnapping, the abduction of a young girl usually is a form of
584 vengeance. It happens that a suitor whose proposals have been evaded by
627 the relatives of the young girl avenges himself by carrying her off
[584] forcibly with the help of his friends.

However, if the abductor then does not consent to marry her the men of the victim's family have the duty to kill him. The justification for the punishment resides in the principles which have been set forth above.

685 The theft of animals.
[594] This act is either a crime or an exploit according to circumstances.
[693] If the thief is caught in the act he is killed on the spot by the shepherds watching their flocks. If he is identified after the deed he must give up the stolen animals in order to acquit himself. If he refuses, he risks being either killed by the injured shepherds or of being deprived of part of his flock in retaliation.

685 /221/ However, an animal thief not caught is the subject of admiration
555 by all, even his victims. For it is not easy to carry off his exploit. In
577 order to manage it, the thief must crawl and climb, without noise in the dar of night without a moon, across gorges and rocks, elude the watch of armed shepherds, escape the scent of the terrible dogs capable of tearing him to shreds in an instant, carry off the sheep without having them bleat of sound their bells, and disappear with them silently into the night.

685 On the other hand, to steal animals in a fixed sheepfold of the winter
577 camp is a shameful act that brings disgrace to the one guilty of it.

685 Finally, this code, so to speak, regarding animal theft implies anothe
577 rule:
783 The thief unidentified and therefore unpunished is in any case